

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Biomarkers of stroke recovery: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9zk2p8p1>

Journal

International journal of stroke : official journal of the International Stroke Society, 12(5)

ISSN

1747-4930

Authors

Boyd, Lara A
Hayward, Kathryn S
Ward, Nick S
et al.

Publication Date

2017-07-01

DOI

10.1177/1747493017714176

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Biomarkers of stroke recovery: Consensus-based core recommendations from the Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable

Lara A Boyd¹, Kathryn S Hayward², Nick S Ward³, Cathy M Stinear⁴, Charlotte Rosso^{5,6}, Rebecca J Fisher⁷, Alexandre R Carter⁸, Alex P Leff⁹, David A Copland¹⁰, Leeanne M Carey¹¹, Leonardo G Cohen¹², D Michele Basso¹³, Jane M Maguire¹⁴ and Steven C Cramer¹⁵

International Journal of Stroke
2017, Vol. 12(5) 480–493
© 2017 World Stroke Organization
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1747493017714176
journals.sagepub.com/home/wso



Abstract

The most difficult clinical questions in stroke rehabilitation are “What is this patient’s potential for recovery?” and “What is the best rehabilitation strategy for this person, given her/his clinical profile?” Without answers to these questions, clinicians struggle to make decisions regarding the content and focus of therapy, and researchers design studies that inadvertently mix participants who have a high likelihood of responding with those who do not. Developing and implementing biomarkers that distinguish patient subgroups will help address these issues and unravel the factors important to the recovery process. The goal of the present paper is to provide a consensus statement regarding the current state of the evidence for stroke recovery biomarkers. Biomarkers of motor, somatosensory, cognitive and language domains across the recovery timeline post-stroke are considered; with focus on brain structure and function, and exclusion of blood markers and genetics. We provide evidence for biomarkers that are considered ready to be included in clinical trials, as well as others that are promising but not ready and so represent a developmental priority. We conclude with an example that illustrates the utility of biomarkers in recovery and rehabilitation research, demonstrating how the inclusion of a biomarker may enhance future clinical trials. In this way, we propose a way forward for when and where we can include biomarkers to advance the efficacy of the practice of, and research into, rehabilitation and recovery after stroke.

Keywords

Biomarker, motor, somatosensory, cognition, language, stratification, function, clinical trial, neuroimaging, human

Received: 9 February 2017; accepted: 15 May 2017

¹Department of Physical Therapy & the Djavd Mowafaghian Centre for Brain Health, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

²Department of Physical Therapy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada; Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Heidelberg, Australia

³Sobell Department of Motor Neuroscience, UCL Institute of Neurology, Queen Square, London, UK

⁴Department of Medicine and Centre for Brain Research, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

⁵Inserm U 1127, CNRS UMR 7225, Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, UMR S 1127, Institut du Cerveau et de la Moelle épinière, ICM, Paris, France

⁶AP-HP, Urgences Cérébro-Vasculaires, Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, Paris, France

⁷Division of Rehabilitation & Ageing, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

⁸Department of Neurology, Washington University in Saint Louis, St Louis, MO, USA

⁹Department of Brain Repair and Rehabilitation, Institute of Neurology & Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, University College London, Queens Square, London, UK

¹⁰School of Health & Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia; and University of Queensland Centre for Clinical Research, Brisbane, Australia

¹¹School of Allied Health, College of Science, Health and Engineering, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia; and Neurorehabilitation and Recovery, Stroke Division, The Florey Institute of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Heidelberg, Australia

¹²Human Cortical Physiology and Neurorehabilitation Section, NINDS, NIH, Bethesda, MD, USA

¹³School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA

¹⁴Faculty of Health, University of Technology, Ultimo, Sydney, Australia

¹⁵University of California, Irvine, CA, USA; Depts. Neurology, Anatomy & Neurobiology, and Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Irvine, CA, USA

Corresponding author:

Lara A Boyd, University of British Columbia, 212, 2177 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada.
Email: lara.boyd@ubc.ca

Introduction

Stroke is a heterogeneous condition, making choice of treatment, and prediction of outcome and treatment response, difficult. Despite this, clinical trials are often designed with a ‘one size fits all’ point of view, which can make them vulnerable to patient heterogeneity, reduced statistical power, and thus failure. Biomarkers can greatly inform patient selection for trials in general medical research, and this is equally true for stroke recovery. A stroke recovery biomarker (SRB) can be defined as an indicator of disease state that can be used as a measure of underlying molecular/cellular processes that may be difficult to measure directly in humans, and could be used to understand outcome, or predict recovery or treatment response.¹

In practical terms, biomarkers should improve our ability to predict long-term outcomes after stroke across multiple domains. This is beneficial for: (a) patients, caregivers and clinicians; (b) planning subsequent clinical pathways and goal setting; and (c) identifying whom and when to target, and in some instances at which dose, with interventions for promoting stroke recovery.² This last point is particularly important as methods for accurate prediction of long-term outcome would allow clinical trials of restorative and rehabilitation interventions to be stratified based on the potential for neurobiological recovery in a way that is currently not possible when trials are performed in the absence of valid biomarkers. Unpredictable outcomes after stroke, particularly in those who present with the most severe impairment³ mean that clinical trials of rehabilitation interventions need hundreds of patients to be appropriately powered. Use of biomarkers would allow incorporation of accurate information about the underlying impairment, and thus the size of these intervention trials could be considerably reduced,⁴ with obvious benefits. These principles are no different in the context of stroke recovery as compared to general medical research.⁵

Interventions fall into two broad mechanistic categories: (1) behavioural interventions that *take*

advantage of experience and learning-dependent plasticity (e.g. motor, sensory, cognitive, and speech and language therapy), and (2) treatments that *enhance the potential for* experience and learning-dependent plasticity to maximise the effects of behavioural interventions (e.g. pharmacotherapy or non-invasive brain stimulation).⁶ To identify in whom and when to intervene, we need biomarkers that reflect the underlying biological mechanisms being targeted therapeutically.

Our goal is to provide a consensus statement regarding the evidence for SRBs that are helpful in outcome prediction and therefore identifying subgroups for stratification to be used in trials.⁷ We focused on SRBs that can investigate the structure or function of the brain (Table 1). Four functional domains (motor, somatosensation, cognition, and language (Table 2)) were considered according to recovery phase post stroke (hyperacute: <24 h; acute: 1 to 7 days; early subacute: 1 week to 3 months; late subacute: 3 months to 6 months; chronic: > 6 months⁸). For each functional domain, we provide recommendations for biomarkers that either are: (1) ready to guide stratification of subgroups of patients for clinical trials and/or to predict outcome, or (2) are a developmental priority (Table 3). Finally, we provide an example of how inclusion of a clinical trial-ready biomarker might have benefitted a recent phase III trial. As there is generally limited evidence at this time for blood or genetic biomarkers, we do not discuss these, but recommend they are a developmental priority.^{9–12} We also recognize that many other functional domains exist, but focus here on the four that have the most developed science.

A challenge across the reviewed literature was to determine where the biomarker data explained recovery beyond that denoted by clinical outcome measures, such as the proportional recovery rule that has been demonstrated using motor,^{3,13} visuospatial neglect¹⁴ and language¹⁵ outcomes. Given the recency of these models, we were unable to address this in this paper and urge people to consider this in their future trial design. Further, to fully understand the predictive

Table 1. Summary of possible brain biomarkers to measure brain structure or function

Measures of structure/injury:	Measures of function:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Computed tomography (CT) • Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) • Diffusion weighted imaging (DWI) • Fluid Attenuation Inversion Recovery (FLAIR) • Gradient echo and spin echo (GRASE) • T1-weighted MRI • T2-weighted MRI • Proton density-weighted MRI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electroencephalography (EEG) • Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) • Magnetoencephalography (MEG) • Magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS) • Near Infrared Spectroscopy Imaging (NIRSI) • Positron emission tomography (PET) • Resting state magnetic resonance imaging (rsMRI) • Sensory electroencephalography (sEEG) • Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS)

Table 2. Scope of functional domains considered given existing literature

<i>Motor</i> refers to motor outcomes, inclusive of upper and lower limb functions.
<i>Sensation</i> refers to somatosensation, touch and proprioception.
<i>Cognition</i> refers to 'executive functioning' or 'cognitive control', which are umbrella terms for sub-processes of selective attention, error monitoring, decision-making memory and response inhibition.
<i>Language</i> refers to spoken language production, auditory language comprehension, and global measures of language function (that also include reading and writing).

Table 3. Scope for expert consensus biomarker recommendations

<i>Ready to be used in clinical trial</i> means that based on the available evidence it is recommended that the biomarker should be included in stroke clinical trials (pilot and feasibility work through to phase II/III/IV trials).
<i>Development priority</i> refers to biomarkers where there is some evidence in human populations with stroke, but questions remain or the evidence is insufficient to support the inclusion of this biomarker in clinical trials at present. Predictive data of outcome and/or recovery is needed to establish its utility in clinical trials.

capacity of biomarkers, we need to move beyond cross-sectional studies, which constitute the bulk of the biomarker literature at present, and conduct mechanistic studies that go beyond simple correlations, as well as conduct longitudinal studies that provide data useful for predicting outcome or treatment response.

Motor

Neuroimaging biomarkers include quantitative characterisation of the stroke lesion itself, as well as the structure and function of non-lesioned brain areas. There is little consensus regarding the usefulness of characterizing the ischemic penumbra at the hyper-acute stage in relation to predicting motor outcomes. Recent data suggest that the site of ischemic penumbra, rather than volume, could predict outcome or treatment response (i.e. to thrombolysis) and affect motor recovery.¹⁶ Acute infarct volume correlates with motor outcome (National Institute of Health Stroke Severity (NIHSS)), but this relationship is attenuated with increasing leukoaraiosis severity.^{17,18} The extent of existing white matter disease (i.e. leukoaraiosis) has

been associated with acute lesion size, degree of lesion expansion and stroke severity indicated by initial NIHSS score.¹⁹ These findings underscore the point that biomarker performance varies across different stroke subgroups.

Measures of corticospinal tract (CST) white matter integrity in the acute stage may predict motor outcome. Early measurement of CST fiber number via diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), a reflection of white matter integrity, predicts motor outcome (Fugl-Meyer score) at 12 months, especially for patients with initially more severe impairment.²⁰ Other data,²¹ though not all,²² also suggest that fractional anisotropy (FA) of the ipsilesional and contralesional CST at the acute stage is higher in individuals who achieve better motor recovery after stroke. Data also support the potential utility of the asymmetry between the ipsilesional and contralesional CST FA to predict treatment gains in the chronic stage.²³

Measures of the extent of CST injury in the **acute** stage, such as via CST lesion load,²⁴ also have predictive value for poor motor outcome. A model including this biomarker improved prediction of Fugl-Meyer motor score at three months post-stroke that was beyond what could be determined by baseline behavioral assessment, age or infarct volume. Several studies have found that in the chronic stage, the extent of CST injury also helps predict treatment gains.^{25–27}

Other regions distant from the lesion influence motor recovery. While measures related to distant regions require further development to reach the stage of valid biomarker, several useful observations have been published in the **chronic** stage, including those related to contralesional CST,²⁸ corpus callosum,²⁹ precentral gyrus,³⁰ and superior longitudinal fasciculi.^{31,32} Multivariate machine learning methods have recently been applied to neuroimaging data with the aim of providing individual predictions based on an approach that integrates features extracted from brain voxels from multiple brain areas, rather than one area.³³ In patients presenting with severe upper limb impairment, classification of a subsequent good or poor recovery was more accurate using lesion information from a range of cortical and subcortical motor-related regions compared to just using CST (87% compared to 73% accuracy respectively).³⁴ Such approaches emphasize the importance of taking account of damage in multiple brain regions, extending beyond CST, in order to better understand variation in motor outcome.^{34–36}

There is broad consensus that the presence of an upper limb motor evoked potential (MEP) in response to transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) at the hyperacute and acute stages strongly predicts good motor outcome^{37,38} and that shorter MEP latencies

and central motor conduction times are associated with better outcome.³⁹ The presence of a MEP has been found to identify which patients will follow the proportional recovery rule.⁴⁰ Similarly, in the leg, the presence of a MEP indicates that an individual is more likely to be independently mobile 12 months post-stroke,^{41–43} yet this measure does not relate to walking recovery.¹³ Prediction of recovery is more challenging for patients without an MEP^{40,44} and combining TMS with MRI biomarkers may be useful in this context.³⁸ TMS at the chronic stage helps explain the relationship between corticomotor function and motor performance in cross-sectional studies, and those who have an MEP are more likely to benefit from physical interventions.^{23,45,46}

Resting state functional connectivity (rsFC) findings in the early and late subacute phases converge on the conclusion that interhemispheric connectivity is of particular importance to motor control. Cross-sectional studies have demonstrated decreased rsFC correlates with the degree of motor impairment.^{47,48} There are positive associations between acute/early subacute rsFC (ipsilesional primary motor cortex [M1] to contralateral thalamus, supplementary motor area (SMA), and medial frontal gyrus) and motor outcomes at six months (Fugl–Meyer score).⁴⁹ In late subacute patients, the amount of CST damage combined with interhemispheric M1 rsFC best predicted therapy-induced gains.²⁷ Fan et al.⁵⁰ found that in late subacute patients, change in interhemispheric M1–M1 rsFC predicts improvements in the Wolf Motor Function Test. Results from a ridge regression machine-learning algorithm analysis of a large sample of early subacute stroke patients suggest that rsFC may explain a smaller amount of the behavioral variance observed than the amount of structural damage to the CST.⁵¹ As rsFC can be performed in patients with severe deficits after stroke and can interrogate all brain networks simultaneously, it represents a priority for development.

Quantitative indices extracted from functional MRI (fMRI) in the early and late subacute stage, such as the laterality index from M1, and the study of its change over time, show that stroke is associated with a less lateralized pattern of activation as compared to healthy subjects, a finding that is exaggerated among patients with poorer outcomes.^{52,53} One unifying conclusion across studies is that the best motor outcomes are associated with the greatest shift towards the normal state of brain function.⁵⁴ The laterality index has been used as a judgment criterion of efficacy in the chronic stage in trials testing mirror therapy,⁵⁵ constraint-induced therapy⁵⁶ and robotic intervention protocols,⁵⁷ and can predict treatment response.⁵⁸ Other fMRI metrics such as activation volume^{59,60} or percent signal change⁶¹ within key motor network nodes can predict

response to treatment in the chronic stage. As there are fewer long-term studies of the laterality index, and it often shows significant biological associations, this is an area of priority for development.

Magnetoencephalography (MEG) or electroencephalography (EEG), non-invasive measures of cortical neuronal oscillations, are sensitive to alterations in both GABAergic and glutamatergic signalling that are important for plasticity and recovery after stroke.^{62–64} Changes in cortical excitation and inhibition represent novel therapeutic targets, but cannot be measured directly in humans. Stroke patients with poorer outcomes have persistent, increased low-frequency oscillations at the acute, and early/late subacute stages,⁶⁵ suggesting predominant inhibitory mechanisms in the peri-lesional cortex. Acutely, lower beta-rebound in response to tactile finger stimulation (which indicates increased early post-stroke sensorimotor excitability)⁶⁶ and increased somatosensory map size⁶⁷ predict good recovery after stroke. Also, in a single stroke patient, zolpidem reversed increased peri-lesional theta (4–10 Hz) and beta oscillations leading to clinical improvement.⁶⁸ In the chronic phase, dense array EEG was able to predict motor gains from a four-week intensive training program.⁶⁹ While MEG/EEG cannot currently be recommended to guide subgroup stratification in trials at present, this is a developmental priority.

Combining neuroimaging and neurophysiology biomarkers may be useful for predicting motor outcomes and therapy response.⁷⁰ Upper limb outcomes at three months can be predicted at the early sub-acute stage by measuring first clinical, then TMS and finally MRI biomarkers in a stepdown approach, as in the PREP algorithm.^{71,72} Stoykov and Stinear⁷³ treated chronic stroke patients using active-passive bilateral arm training and discovered that fractional anisotropy asymmetry between the two CST tracts accounted for 40% variability in clinical improvement. Factoring in whether patients were MEP+/- improved the predictive model. One recent study emphasized that combining neuroimaging measures of neural injury and neural function was key to best predicting response to a standardized robotic therapy in the chronic stage.²⁷

In summary, neuroimaging and neurophysiology CST biomarkers can predict motor outcome and response to therapy after stroke, and are recommended for use in clinical trials, e.g. for stratifying patients. The evidences for rsFC, fMRI and MEG/EEG biomarkers are promising and are developmental priority areas (Table 4a).

Somatosensory

Currently, there are few studies of structural or functional biomarkers conducted to understand outcome,

Table 4. Expert consensus biomarker recommendations

A) Motor
<i>Ready to be used in clinical trial.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CST indexed by DTI or by lesion overlap in the hyperacute, acute, early and late subacute, and chronic phases, which has demonstrated a moderate to strong relationship with impairment (outcome and recovery) • TMS measure of MEP+ or MEP- of the upper limb to understand and track motor recovery up to the late subacute phase and understand the effects of rehabilitation interventions up to the chronic phase post-stroke. There is evidence of a strong relationship between impairment (outcome and recovery) and MEP status. We recommend that future studies of upper limb interventions determine whether patients are MEP+ or MEP- for the purposes of stratification.
<i>Developmental priority</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesion location measured in the hyperacute phase. Identifying critical areas damaged that could predict recovery or treatment response may be important. Combining location and volume of stroke damage using multivariate techniques is the next logical step. • Leukoaraiosis and covert lesions in the hyperacute, early and late acute and chronic phases require further validation to understand how they impact motor recovery. • Accumulate further evidence of the usefulness of MEP+/- in the lower limb. • Determining the utility of the laterality index from functional MRI as a predictor of efficacy in earlier stages post stroke is a developmental priority. • Determine the utility of measures of rsFC and task-based activation and MEG/sEEG to predict treatment response in the early subacute, late subacute and chronic stages of recovery.
B) Somatosensory
<i>Ready to be used in clinical trial</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no somatosensory system biomarkers ready for clinical trials.
<i>Developmental priority</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand outcome and predict somatosensory recovery in the acute through to chronic stages using: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Biologically reliable measures of white matter fibre tract integrity and connectivity within and across brain networks e.g. using diffusion-based tractography. ○ Measures of rsFC, and fMRI activation.

(continued)

Table 4. Continued

C) Cognition
<i>Ready to be used in clinical trial</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no biomarkers ready to be used in clinical trials.
<i>Developmental priority</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand outcome and predict recovery in the acute to chronic stages of recovery using <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Measures of white matter integrity within both lesioned and non-lesioned areas. ○ Measures of rsFC and task-based FC. • Predict treatment response in the early subacute, late subacute and chronic stages of recovery using measures of rsFC and fMRI activation.
D) Language
<i>Ready to be used in clinical trials</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index structural damage as per PLORAS imaging protocol in the chronic phase of recovery to understand outcome and predict recovery. When the PLORAS database is used with an individual's lesion information combined with time post-stroke and speech behaviour it provides a strong predictor of longitudinal aphasia recovery.
<i>Developmental priority</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Index structural damage to and integrity of the arcuate fasciculus with diffusion weighted imaging in the late subacute and chronic phases of recovery to understand and predict outcome. • Predict recovery using perfusion CT and MRI in the hyperacute phase. • Determine if structural damage predicts therapy or treatment response in the subacute through to chronic phases. • Predict recovery and treatment response in subacute to chronic phase using measures of task-based fMRI activation. • Explore measures of inter and intra-network connectivity (including rsFC) and multivariate connectome-based symptom mapping for prediction of outcome and treatment response.

CST: corticospinal tract; CT: computed tomography; DTI: diffusion tensor imaging; FC: functional connectivity; fMRI: functional magnetic resonance imaging; MEP+: motor evoked potential present; MEG: magnetoencephalography; MEP-: motor evoked potential absent; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; PLORAS: predicting language recovery and outcome after stroke; rsFC: resting state functional connectivity; sEEG: sensory electroencephalography.

predict recovery or predict treatment response in the somatosensory functioning domain in the hyperacute or acute phases post-stroke. Most work on structural biomarkers involving the non-lesioned brain has focused on understanding outcome by mapping the structural integrity of residual pathways. Feasibility of visualisation of sensorimotor systems by tracking fibres has been demonstrated in hyperacute, acute and early subacute phases for somatosensory symptoms.⁷⁴ There are changes in morphology of the somatosensory cortex of chronic stroke patients,⁷⁵ with co-localized structural (cortical thickness) and functional (brain activation, tactile stimulation) effects. Only one study noted associations between the structure of somatosensory regions and motor outcome in the chronic phase.⁷⁶

Failure to activate the somatosensory cortex during median nerve stimulation in the acute stage predicts poor clinical recovery at three months.⁷⁷ Using MEG, reduction in interhemispheric asymmetries of activity at chronic compared to acute phases was associated with a worse clinical state.⁷⁸ Studies using MEG in early and late subacute phases show that changes in source strength of the primary somatosensory cortices correlate with the extent of recovery of sensorimotor functions as determined by neurological exams (e.g. graphesthesia test).⁷⁹ Yet, MEG can be complicated to employ, and so broader evaluation of these findings might benefit from use of less complex electrophysiological methods such as EEG. In the subacute phase, differences in brain activity measured with task-related fMRI correlated with touch impairment in patients with thalamus/internal capsule lesions compared to those with lesions of primary (SI) or secondary (SII) somatosensory cortex.⁸⁰ Similarly, responsiveness of SI at 1–15 days post-stroke is associated with improvement of two-point discrimination three months post-stroke.⁸¹ Resting-state FC studies of touch impairment and recovery in the chronic phase demonstrated a correlation between changes in connectivity from contralesional SII and contralesional inferior parietal and middle temporal gyrus with changes in a tactile discrimination score that were absent in a control group.⁸²

Associations are observed between somatosensory function (using the Hand Active Sensation Test) and a left/right FA ratio from the sensory component of the superior thalamic radiation in the chronic stage⁸³ and the frontoparietal tracts in the acute⁸⁴ and chronic⁸⁵ phases. In addition, somatosensation function in the chronic phase correlates with activity in the ipsilesional and contralesional primary sensorimotor cortex⁸⁶ and a more distributed pattern of activity involving parietal cortex.⁸³ Improvement in touch discrimination at six months was associated with increased rsFC between seeds in the contralesional hemisphere and distributed regions, including cerebellum.⁸² Using MEG,

involvement of ipsilesional primary hand representation areas positively contributed to clinical recovery.⁸⁷

Changes have also been reported in association with training of touch discrimination,⁸⁸ passive proprioception⁸⁹ and sensorimotor function,⁹⁰ with a focus on tracking outcomes and mechanisms, rather than prediction. For example, touch discrimination training of patients with somatosensory loss in the chronic stage post-stroke was associated with different patterns of change in activation with thalamic/capsular compared to SI/SII cortical lesion.⁸⁸ This area of research is a priority for development.

There is insufficient evidence to recommend the use of any specific biomarkers of somatosensory system function in clinical trials; however, several candidates are suggested. The recovery of somatosensation is often overlooked despite well-documented observations that impaired sensation is an impediment to optimal recovery.^{91–93} Functional biomarkers, including task-related activation and rsFC are a developmental priority (Table 4b).

Cognition

Mapping executive/cognitive functions to specific brain regions is problematic because these functions are distributed widely across broad brain networks, and their relationships are complex. Indeed, studies that readily identify structure–function relationships for phonology and semantic processing, and often fail to find an equivalent for executive function.⁹⁴ The most consistent relationships were found in white matter. Frontal and basal ganglia region microbleeds were associated with executive dysfunction outcome in the chronic phase,⁹⁵ and another study found that mean diffusivity of normal appearing white matter (whole brain) in non-lesioned areas correlated with outcomes for executive function among individuals with ischaemic leukoaraiosis (plus a previous lacunar stroke).^{96,97} EEG changes in frontal lobes paralleled behavioral gains across multiple cognitive domains in one study that used intensive video gaming in health adults;⁹⁸ the same may extend to patients with stroke.

Though functional imaging methods may offer the best hope of generating robust biomarkers for executive function, there is little published work. Available associations are correlative and from cross-sectional studies, rather than predictions of outcomes or more complex evaluation of biological hypotheses. In the late subacute phase, executive functioning correlates with alpha band functional connectivity between the left fronto-opercular cortex and the rest of the brain.⁹⁹ Yet, it is possible that the task-dependent changes observed with functional imaging data have less to do with new domain-specific areas being

generated, and more to do with cognitive control networks improving residual performance.¹⁰⁰ In individuals with chronic post-stroke aphasia, a positive correlation between task-dependent activity in midline frontal cortex and language recovery was interpreted as reflecting domain-general cognitive control systems,¹⁰¹ a finding that is consistent with training effects in healthy elderly subjects.⁹⁸ Development of biomarkers in this context would likely foster advances in therapeutic techniques to train executive function, a key priority that is feasible.¹⁰²

The default mode network (DMN) has emerged as a key biological substrate in the context of cognitive functioning.¹⁰³ Studies in the subacute and early chronic phases report altered rsFC in the DMN correlated with cognitive performance after stroke^{104–107} Re-emergence of the anticorrelation between the DMN and task-positive networks, such as the dorsal attention network (DAN),¹⁰⁸ is associated with behavioural recovery of cognitive functions. Resting state studies have provided robust examples of disruption of inter-hemispheric connectivity associated with domain-specific cognitive deficits^{47,51,109,110} and recovery.¹¹¹ In a small longitudinal study of stroke patients compared to healthy controls, He et al.¹¹¹ showed a robust correlation between left-right posterior intraparietal sulcus rsFC and accuracy of detection of targets presented in the left neglected visual field. Multiple studies have confirmed this connectivity is much depressed in the acute stage after stroke in persons with USN and returns toward normal in association with the resolution of symptoms, with the largest current longitudinal study retaining 64 stroke patients at 12 months. Similar relationships have been reported for the DMN and other networks.^{47,51,109,110} While correlational analyses cannot establish causality and do not provide the predictive functions required of an effective SRB, the finding that a change in rsFC correlates with behaviour lends support to the idea that measures of network connectivity have the potential to serve as useful biomarkers across multiple behavioural domains, a possibility that requires further studies.

In the domain of spatial cognition, multiple moderately sized studies of right hemisphere injury confirm that damage to different major long range white matter tracts may predict chronic persistence of unilateral spatial neglect. Two well-designed longitudinal studies implicate the inferior occipitofrontal fasciculus and uncinate fasciculus¹¹² and decreased FA in the left and right superior longitudinal fasciculus II, and forceps major of the corpus callosum with neglect scores. In cross-sectional studies, linear regression shows an association of unilateral spatial neglect with damage to the fronto-parietal segment of the arcuate fasciculus, and that 78.9% and 81.6% of patients with neglect

had damage to the superior longitudinal fasciculus II and superior longitudinal fasciculus III, respectively, compared to only 15% and 30% in patients without neglect.¹¹³ While damage to superior longitudinal fasciculus III, arcuate fasciculus, frontal aslant, and frontal inferior longitudinal fasciculus are increasingly implicated in abnormal spatial cognition.¹¹⁴ Whether damage to any of these white matter structures as measured in the acute phase of stroke can serve as a biomarker for persistence of USN in the chronic phase, or in stratifying or selecting patients for interventions is yet to be determined.

Based on this evidence, biomarkers of cognitive function, including executive functioning, are not ready for immediate broad implementation in clinical trials. Thus, further study and validation of biomarkers that explain current state and future change in cognitive functions are a significant priority area for development. Resting state FC is a promising candidate biomarker (Table 4c), and study of its utility as a biomarker of recovery is emphasized here.

Language

There are a number of studies identifying a relationship between lesion site and aphasia,¹¹⁵ anatomical findings that suggest potential metrics to evaluate as biomarkers. In the hyperacute period, perfusion-weighted MRI showed that word comprehension deficits are strongly correlated with blood flow within Wernicke's area.¹¹⁶ A related study demonstrated that lexical processing was more strongly related to the volume of hypo-perfused tissue than the volume of lesion.¹¹⁷ Imaging illustrates that recovery of word comprehension from the hyperacute to acute phase (three days) is associated with reperfusion of Wernicke's area.¹¹⁸ Recovery of naming in the hyperacute period is predicted by reperfusion of left posterior middle temporal/fusiform gyrus, Broca's area, and/or Wernicke's area.^{119–121} There are no established predictors of long-term (>3 days) recovery from biomarkers assessed in the hyperacute period (<24 h); thus, this is a developmental priority.

Impaired repetition in the acute phase was associated with structural damage to the arcuate fasciculus and Broca's area as well as tissue dysfunction (hypo-perfusion and frank damage) in the inferior portion of the left supramarginal gyrus and temporal-parietal junction.¹²² Kummerer et al.,¹²³ also observed that impaired repetition at this phase was associated with posterior temporal-parietal lesions and damage to the dorsal superior longitudinal and arcuate fasciculus, while comprehension deficits were associated with ventral extreme capsule fibre damage. Measures of functional connectivity may also be useful in this phase, as a

recent study of acute lacunar stroke patients observed that increased resting state FC between the left and right superior temporal gyri was correlated with poorer language function.¹²⁴

In the early subacute phase, there are relationships between lesion location and aphasia symptoms that suggest potential biomarkers. Kreisler et al.¹²⁵ correctly classified 67% to 94% of patients based on analysis of lesion location and symptoms. Forkel et al.,¹²⁶ demonstrated prediction of recovery at six months was improved by adding volume of the left long segment of the arcuate fasciculus to a regression model including age, sex, and lesion size; including volume of the right long segment of the arcuate fasciculus further improved recovery prediction. Recent work by Geranmayeh et al.,¹²⁷ showed that propositional language production is predicted by interactions between brain networks (DMN, fronto-temporo-parietal, and cingulo-opercular networks) rather than by activity within a single individual network highlighting the distributed nature of language operations. Functional MRI activity in the early subacute phase shows promise as a predictor of long-term recovery when analyzed using a multivariate machine learning technique. Saur et al.,¹²⁸ employed this method with a mask of task-induced fMRI activity in bilateral frontal and temporal regions in combination with behavioural language performance and age. This approach correctly predicted good versus poor language recovery in 86% of individuals with stroke who had aphasia at two weeks. In the largest case-control study of subacute stroke patients with aphasia to date, Yang et al.¹²⁴ found that in patients with lacunar stroke, interhemispheric rsFC was increased in the superior temporal gyrus, the inferior frontal gyrus and the lingual gyrus. Of note is the observation that the interhemispheric hyperconnectivity of the superior temporal gyrus was inversely correlated with the aphasia quotient, indicating that greater connectivity was associated with worse aphasia.

Voxel-based analyses in the chronic phase has established utility in multiple brain systems and specifically have identified structural damage associated with particular aphasic symptoms, distinguishing between semantic and phonological processes and recognition versus production.^{129–131} Arcuate fasciculus lesion load negatively influences speech production¹³² and classifies severe and non-severe outcomes with 90% accuracy for naming and 96% accuracy for speech fluency.¹³³ The PLORAS (Predicting Language Outcome and Recovery After Stroke) system¹³⁴ uses a Gaussian process model regression with a large database of stroke patients (from one month post, therefore covering early and late subacute, and chronic phases) with structural MRI, demographic, and language

performance to provide predictions of aphasia recovery at the individual level. Using this approach and covariate factors of time of stroke, volume, and 35 different brain regions, predictions of language outcome, and within subject changes in speech production, have been identified.¹³⁵ This method has high potential to provide measures that can serve as biomarkers to predict recovery.

Posterior middle temporal lobe damage can negatively affect aphasia therapy outcome in the chronic phase.¹²² Meinzer et al.¹³⁶ observed a negative relationship between the proximity of the lesion to the hippocampus and response to a naming treatment. Bonilha et al.¹³⁷ showed that measures of neural network connectivity combined with initial behavioral deficit severity accounted for 78% of variance in response to anomia treatment. Several small studies identified a relationship between therapy success and integrity of the left arcuate fasciculus,¹³⁸ right arcuate fasciculus¹³⁹ and white matter in proximity to the hippocampus.¹³⁶ Further, several fMRI studies have investigated treatment-induced aphasia recovery, predominantly in the chronic stage. Fridriksson¹²² identified a significant relationship between treatment-induced naming improvements and fMRI activity in the both a posterior cluster (including parietal lobe and precuneus) and an anterior cluster (including middle frontal gyrus and pars opercularis). Subsequent analyses¹⁴⁰ showed that altered activity in perilesional areas was associated with increased naming accuracy, but measures of pre-treatment brain activity (as opposed to changes in activity) predicted improvement in semantic errors, suggesting additional factors contribute to treatment outcome. Resting state FC has also shown potential for understanding and predicting aphasia recovery in the subacute and chronic phases (including treatment induced improvements); however, larger studies are required to validate this approach.¹⁴¹

In summary, in the acute and early subacute stages, the use of structural MRI provides insights into the neural basis of language deficits, but there are not sufficient large studies demonstrating that these methods clearly improve prediction of recovery or treatment response. Functional brain assessments such as via fMRI show potential at the early subacute stage for significantly improving prediction of outcome,¹²⁷ however, this approach needs validation. Structural MRI and DTI may forecast recovery at the late subacute and chronic stage, suggesting the possible use of these techniques to stratify patients for clinical trials, understand therapy mechanism and predict outcome. It should be noted that: (1) there is still considerable variability in outcome that is not accounted for by these methods, (2) each method uses a unique and complex analysis technique, (3) different aphasia treatments may

engage unique networks (Table 4d), and (4) detailed studies examining the combined utility of anatomical and functional brain measures for predicting language recovery are warranted.

Conclusions

How might biomarker data be incorporated into future stroke recovery research? As a first point, the term “stroke” is inadequate, as it describes a very heterogeneous group of disorders that are unified by a vascular injury, but not by size, location, or impact of injury. Biomarkers present a way forward to subgroup or stratify patients in order to reduce variance and increase power, allowing for smaller sample sizes.⁷ Moreover, the final behavioral phenotype after stroke can arise from many different biological states, which could result in differential therapeutic responses; functional measures are complementary to anatomical/injury measures. Thus, a patient exploiting all possible compensatory brain mechanisms might have little room to improve, while a similar patient who uses no compensatory mechanisms might achieve benefit.¹⁴² Furthermore, inclusion of appropriate biomarkers may improve the ability to disentangle treatment responders from non-responders.

Clinical trials therefore need to base participant eligibility on more than presence of a stroke, or behavioural status. Instead, patient selection should include appropriate biomarkers; ideally, these will be linked with preclinical methods as well as the biological mechanism of the therapy or treatment under investigation. For example, recently, a threshold was defined whereby no patient in the early and late subacute stage with >63% injury to the CST achieved clinically important gains associated with a robotic therapy.²⁷ This result highlights the ascendant role that neuroimaging measures need to play in clinical-decision making for post-stroke rehabilitation.¹⁴³

A useful example comes from the recent phase III Everest trial,¹⁴⁴ which relied on behavioural assessments to determine participant eligibility, and ultimately found that patients randomized to epidural motor cortex stimulation did not reach the primary efficacy endpoint more often than patients in the control group. However, a post hoc analysis of patients randomized to epidural stimulation found that the primary efficacy endpoint was reached more often (67%) by those with preserved motor evoked responses upon cortical stimulation compared to those lacking a response (27%).²⁶ Thus, had confirmation of physiological integrity of the biological target been an eligibility criterion (as was the case in all preclinical studies that were translated to generate this trial), the effect size would have been substantially higher and the trial

results quite different. We believe that this example is highly useful in illustrating the utility of biomarkers in recovery and rehabilitation research and expect that the inclusion of biomarkers will enhance future clinical trials.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Professor Julie Bernhardt for convening this first Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Roundtable (SRRR), Ms Katie Lafferty for moderating discussions at SRRR and Dr Karen Borschmann for project management. We acknowledge the following organisations for their financial support of the meeting: National Health and Medical Research Centre (NHMRC) Centre of Research Excellence in Stroke Rehabilitation & Brain Recovery (Australia), Heart and Stroke Foundation (HSF) of Canada, Heart and Stroke Foundation Canadian Partnership for Stroke Recovery (CPSR). An unrestricted educational grant was provided by Ipsen Pharma.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: LAB was supported by the Canada Research Chairs and MSFHR (CI-SCH-01796); KSH was supported by NHMRC (1088449) and Micheal Smith Foundation for Health Research (MSFHR) (15980); SCC was supported by a grant from NIH (K24 HD074722). DAC was supported by a University of Queensland Vice Chancellor's Fellowship; LMC acknowledges support from National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) grants (#1022694; #307905), James S. McDonnell Foundation 21st Century Science Initiative in Cognitive Rehabilitation -Collaborative Award (#220020413), NHMRC CRE in Stroke Rehabilitation and Brain Injury (#1077898) and an Australian Research Council Future Fellowship (#FT0992299).

References

1. Bernhardt J, Borschmann K, Boyd L, et al. Moving rehabilitation research forward: developing consensus statements for rehabilitation and recovery research. *Int J Stroke* 2016; 11: 454–458.
2. Cramer SC, Koroshetz WJ and Finklestein SP. The case for modality-specific outcome measures in clinical trials of stroke recovery-promoting agents. *Stroke* 2007; 38: 1393–1395.
3. Krakauer JW and Marshall RS. The proportional recovery rule for stroke revisited. *Ann Neurol* 2015; 78: 845–847.
4. Winters C, Heymans MW, van Wegen EE and Kwakkel G. How to design clinical rehabilitation trials for the upper paretic limb early post stroke? *Trials* 2016; 17: 468.

5. Milot MH and Cramer SC. Biomarkers of recovery after stroke. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2008; 21: 654–659.
6. Ward NS. Restoring brain function after stroke – bridging the gap between animals and humans. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2017; 13: 244–255.
7. Cramer SC. Stratifying patients with stroke in trials that target brain repair. *Stroke* 2010; 41(10 Suppl): S114–S116.
8. Bernhardt J, Hayward KS, Kwakkel G, et al. Agreed definitions and a shared vision for new standards in stroke recovery research: the Stroke recovery and rehabilitation roundtable taskforce. *Int J Stroke* 2017 (in press). DOI: 10.1177/1747493017711816.
9. Kim EJ, Park CH, Chang WH, et al. The brain-derived neurotrophic factor Val66Met polymorphism and degeneration of the corticospinal tract after stroke: a diffusion tensor imaging study. *Eur J Neurol* 2016; 23: 76–84.
10. Whiteley W, Wardlaw J, Dennis M, et al. The use of blood biomarkers to predict poor outcome after acute transient ischemic attack or ischemic stroke. *Stroke* 2012; 43: 86–91.
11. Lindgren A and Maguire J. Stroke recovery genetics. *Stroke* 2016; 47: 2427–2434.
12. Farr TD and Wegener S. Use of magnetic resonance imaging to predict outcome after stroke: a review of experimental and clinical evidence. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab* 2010; 30: 703–717.
13. Smith MC, Byblow WD, Barber PA and Stinear CM. Proportional recovery from lower limb motor impairment after stroke. *Stroke* 2017; 48: 1400–1403.
14. Winters C, van Wegen E, Daffershofer A and Kwakkel G. Generalizability of the maximum proportional recovery rule to visuospatial neglect early poststroke. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2017; 31: 334–342.
15. Lazar RM, Minzer B, Antonietto D, Festa JR, Krakauer JW and Marshall RS. Improvement in aphasia scores after stroke is well predicted by initial severity. *Stroke* 2010; 41: 1485–1488.
16. Rosso C and Samson Y. The ischemic penumbra: the location rather than the volume of recovery determines outcome. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2014; 27: 35–41.
17. Helenius J and Henninger N. Leukoaraiosis burden significantly modulates the association between infarct volume and National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale in ischemic stroke. *Stroke* 2015; 46: 1857–1863.
18. Kasner SE. Clinical interpretation and use of stroke scales. *Lancet Neurol* 2006; 5: 603–612.
19. Henninger N, Lin E, Haussen DC, et al. Leukoaraiosis and sex predict the hyperacute ischemic core volume. *Stroke* 2012; 44: 61–67.
20. Bigourdan A, Munsch F, Coupe P, et al. Early fiber number ratio is a surrogate of corticospinal tract integrity and predicts motor recovery after stroke. *Stroke* 2016; 47: 1053–1059.
21. Wen H, Alshikho MJ, Wang Y, et al. Correlation of Fractional anisotropy with motor recovery in patients with stroke after postacute rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehab* 2016; 97: 1487–1495.
22. Doughty C, Wang J, Feng W, Hackney D, Pani E and Schlaug G. Detection and predictive value of fractional anisotropy changes of the corticospinal tract in the acute phase of a stroke. *Stroke* 2016; 47: 1520–1526.
23. Stinear CM, Barber PA, Smale PR, Coxon JP, Fleming MK and Byblow WD. Functional potential in chronic stroke patients depends on corticospinal tract integrity. *Brain* 2007; 130(Pt 1): 170–180.
24. Feng W, Wang J, Chhatbar PY, et al. Corticospinal tract lesion load: an imaging biomarker for stroke motor outcomes. *Ann Neurol* 2015; 78: 860–870.
25. Riley JD, Le V, Der-Yeghiaian L, et al. Anatomy of stroke injury predicts gains from therapy. *Stroke* 2011; 42: 421–426.
26. Nouri S and Cramer SC. Anatomy and physiology predict response to motor cortex stimulation after stroke. *Neurology* 2011; 77: 1076–1083.
27. Burke Quinlan E, Dodakian L, See J, et al. Neural function, injury, and stroke subtype predict treatment gains after stroke. *Ann Neurol* 2015; 77: 132–145.
28. Borich MR, Mang C and Boyd LA. Both projection and commissural pathways are disrupted in individuals with chronic stroke: investigating microstructural white matter correlates of motor recovery. *BMC Neurol* 2012; 13: 107.
29. Mang CS, Borich MR, Brodie SM, et al. Diffusion imaging and transcranial magnetic stimulation assessment of transcallosal pathways in chronic stroke. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2015; 10: 1951–1971.
30. Borich MR, Neva JL and Boyd LA. Evaluation of differences in brain neurophysiology and morphometry associated with hand function in individuals with chronic stroke. *Restor Neurol Neurosci* 2015; 33: 31–42.
31. Buch ER, Modir Shanechi A, Fourkas AD, Weber C, Birbaumer N and Cohen LG. Parietofrontal integrity determines neural modulation associated with grasping imagery after stroke. *Brain* 2012; 135: 596–614.
32. Censor N, Buch ER, Nader K and Cohen LG. Altered human memory modification in the presence of normal consolidation. *Cereb Cortex* 2016; 26: 3928–3927.
33. Mah YH, Husain M, Rees G and Nachev P. Human brain lesion-deficit inference remapped. *Brain* 2014; 137(Pt 9): 2522–2531.
34. Rondina JM, Park CH and Ward NS. Brain regions important for recovery after severe post-stroke upper limb paresis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr* 2017 (in press).
35. Rondina JM, Filippone M, Girolami M and Ward NS. Decoding post-stroke motor function from structural brain imaging. *Neuroimage Clin* 2016; 12: 372–380.
36. Park CH, Kou N and Ward NS. The contribution of lesion location to upper limb deficit after stroke. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr* 2016; 87: 1283–1286.
37. Talelli P, Greenwood RJ and Rothwell JC. Arm function after stroke: neurophysiological correlates and recovery mechanisms assessed by transcranial magnetic stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2006; 117: 1641–1659.
38. Stinear CM, Barber PA, Petoe M, Anwar S and Byblow WD. The PREP algorithm predicts potential for upper limb recovery after stroke. *Brain* 2012; 135: 2527–2535.
39. Heald A, Bates D, Cartlidge NE, French JM and Miller S. Longitudinal study of central motor conduction time following stroke. 2. Central motor conduction measured

- within 72 h after stroke as a predictor of functional outcome at 12 months. *Brain* 1993; 116: 1371–1385.
40. Byblow WD, Stinear CM, Barber PA, Petoe MA and Ackerley SJ. Proportional recovery after stroke depends on corticomotor integrity. *Ann Neurol* 2015; 78: 8488–59.
 41. Chang MC, Do KH and Chun MH. Prediction of lower limb motor outcomes based on transcranial magnetic stimulation findings in patients with an infarct of the anterior cerebral artery. *Somatosens Motor Res* 2015; 32: 249–253.
 42. Piron L, Piccione F, Tonin P and Dam M. Clinical correlation between motor evoked potentials and gait recovery in poststroke patients. *Arch Phys Med Rehab* 2005; 86: 1874–1878.
 43. Steube D, Wietholter S and Correll C. Prognostic value of lower limb motor evoked potentials for motor impairment and disability after 8 weeks of stroke rehabilitation – a prospective investigation of 100 patients. *Electromyograph Clin Neurophysiol* 2001; 41: 463–469.
 44. Hayward KS, Schmidt J, Lohse KR, et al. Are we armed with the right data? Pooled individual data review of biomarkers in people with severe upper limb impairment after stroke. *Neuroimage Clin* 2017; 13: 310–319.
 45. Koski L, Mernar TJ and Dobkin BH. Immediate and long-term changes in corticomotor output in response to rehabilitation: correlation with functional improvements in chronic stroke. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2004; 18: 230–249.
 46. Lai CJ, Wang CP, Tsai PY, et al. Corticospinal integrity and motor impairment predict outcomes after excitatory repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation: a preliminary study. *Arch Phys Med Rehab* 2015; 96: 69–75.
 47. Carter AR, Astafiev SV, Lang CE, et al. Resting inter-hemispheric functional magnetic resonance imaging connectivity predicts performance after stroke. *Ann Neurol* 2010; 67: 365–375.
 48. Baldassarre A, Ramsey L, Rengachary J, et al. Dissociated functional connectivity profiles for motor and attention deficits in acute right-hemisphere stroke. *Brain* 2016; 139: 2024–2038.
 49. Park CH, Chang WH, Ohn SH, et al. Longitudinal changes of resting-state functional connectivity during motor recovery after stroke. *Stroke* 2011; 42: 1357–1362.
 50. Fan YT, Wu CY, Liu HL, et al. Neuroplastic changes in resting-state functional connectivity after stroke rehabilitation. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2015; 9: 546.
 51. Siegel JS, Ramsey LE and Snyder AZ. Disruptions of network connectivity predict impairment in multiple behavioral domains after stroke. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2016; 113: E4367–E4376.
 52. Feydy A, Carlier R, Roby-Brami A, et al. Longitudinal study of motor recovery after stroke: recruitment and focusing of brain activation. *Stroke* 2002; 33: 1610–1617.
 53. Schaechter JD, Kraft E, Hilliard TS, et al. Motor recovery and cortical reorganization after constraint-induced movement therapy in stroke patients: a preliminary study. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2002; 16: 326–338.
 54. Calautti C and Baron JC. Functional neuroimaging studies of motor recovery after stroke in adults: a review. *Stroke* 2003; 34: 1553–1566.
 55. Michielsen ME, Selles RW, van der Geest JN, et al. Motor recovery and cortical reorganization after mirror therapy in chronic stroke patients: a phase II randomized controlled trial. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2011; 25: 2230–2233.
 56. Schaechter JD, Kraft E, Hilliard TS, et al. Motor recovery and cortical reorganization after constraint-induced movement therapy in stroke patients: a preliminary study. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2002; 16: 326–338.
 57. Milot MH, Spencer SJ, Chan V, et al. Corticospinal excitability as a predictor of functional gains at the affected upper limb following robotic training in chronic stroke survivors. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2014; 28: 819–827.
 58. Dong Y, Dobkin BH, Cen SY, Wu AD and Winstein CJ. Motor cortex activation during treatment may predict therapeutic gains in paretic hand function after stroke. *Stroke* 2006; 37: 1552–1555.
 59. Takahashi CD, Der-Yeghiaian L, Le V, Motiwala RR and Cramer SC. Robot-based hand motor therapy after stroke. *Brain* 2008; 131: 425–537.
 60. Burke E, Dobkin BH, Noser EA, Enney LA and Cramer SC. Predictors and biomarkers of treatment gains in a clinical stroke trial targeting the lower extremity. *Stroke* 2014; 45: 2379–2384.
 61. Cramer SC, Parrish TB, Levy RM, et al. Predicting functional gains in a stroke trial. *Stroke* 2007; 38: 2108–2114.
 62. Ward NS. Using oscillations to understand recovery after stroke. *Brain* 2015; 138: 2811–2813.
 63. Rabiller G, He JW, Nishijima Y, Wong A and Liu J. Perturbation of brain oscillations after ischemic stroke: a potential biomarker for post-stroke function and therapy. *Int J Mol Sci* 2015; 16: 25605–25640.
 64. Paggiaro A, Birbaumer N, Cavinato M, et al. Magnetoencephalography in stroke recovery and rehabilitation. *Front Neurol* 2016; 7: 35.
 65. Laaksonen K, Helle L, Parkkonen L, et al. Alterations in spontaneous brain oscillations during stroke recovery. *PLoS One* 2013; 8: e61146.
 66. Laaksonen K, Kirveskari E, Makela JP, et al. Effect of afferent input on motor cortex excitability during stroke recovery. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2012; 123: 2429–2436.
 67. Roiha K, Kirveskari E, Kaste M, et al. Reorganization of the primary somatosensory cortex during stroke recovery. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2011; 122: 339–345.
 68. Hall SD, Yamawaki N, Fisher AE, Clauss RP, Woodhall GL and Stanford IM. GABA(A) alpha-1 subunit mediated desynchronization of elevated low frequency oscillations alleviates specific dysfunction in stroke – a case report. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2010; 121: 5495–55.
 69. Wu J, Quinlan EB, Dodakian L, et al. Connectivity measures are robust biomarkers of cortical function and plasticity after stroke. *Brain* 2015; 138: 2359–2369.
 70. Kim B and Winstein C. Can neurological biomarkers of brain impairment be used to predict poststroke motor recovery? A systematic review. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2017; 31: 3–24.

71. Stinear CM, Barber PA, Petoe M, Anwar S and Byblow WD. The PREP algorithm predicts potential for upper limb recovery after stroke. *Brain* 2012; 135: 2527–2535.
72. Stinear CM, Byblow WD, Ackerley SJ, Barber PA and Smith MC. Predicting recovery potential for individual stroke patients increases rehabilitation efficiency. *Stroke* 2017; 48: 1011–1019.
73. Stoykov ME and Stinear JW. Active-passive bilateral therapy as a priming mechanism for individuals in the subacute phase of post-stroke recovery: a feasibility study. *Am J Phys Med Rehab* 2010; 89: 873–878.
74. Yamada K, Mori S, Nakamura H, et al. Fiber-tracking method reveals sensorimotor pathway involvement in stroke patients. *Stroke* 2003; 34: E159–E162.
75. Schaechter JD, Moore CI, Connell BD, Rosen BR and Dijkhuizen RM. Structural and functional plasticity in the somatosensory cortex of chronic stroke patients. *Brain* 2006; 129: 2722–2733.
76. Brodie SM, Borich MR and Boyd LA. Impact of 5-Hz rTMS over the primary sensory cortex is related to white matter volume in individuals with chronic stroke. *Eur J Neurosci* 2014; 40: 3405–3412.
77. Manganotti P, Storti SF, Formaggio E, et al. Effect of median-nerve electrical stimulation on BOLD activity in acute ischemic stroke patients. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2012; 123: 142–153.
78. Tecchio F, Zappasodi F, Tombini M, et al. Brain plasticity in recovery from stroke: an MEG assessment. *Neuroimage* 2006; 32: 1326–1334.
79. Huang M, Davis LE, Aine C, et al. MEG response to median nerve stimulation correlates with recovery of sensory and motor function after stroke. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2004; 115: 820–833.
80. Carey LM, Abbott DF, Harvey MR, Puce A, Seitz RJ and Donnan GA. Relationship between touch impairment and brain activation after lesions of subcortical and cortical somatosensory regions. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2011; 25: 443–457.
81. Wikstrom H, Roine RO, Aronen HJ, et al. Specific changes in somatosensory evoked magnetic fields during recovery from sensorimotor stroke. *Ann Neurol* 2000; 47: 353–360.
82. Bannister LC, Crewther SG, Gavrilescu M and Carey LM. Improvement in Touch sensation after stroke is associated with resting functional connectivity changes. *Front Neurol* 2015; 6: 165.
83. Borstad A, Schmalbrock P, Choi S and Nichols-Larsen DS. Neural correlates supporting sensory discrimination after left hemisphere stroke. *Brain Res* 2012; 1460: 78–87.
84. Meyer S, Kessner SS, Cheng B, et al. Voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping of stroke lesions underlying somatosensory deficits. *Neuroimage Clin* 2016; 10: 257–266.
85. Borstad AL, Choi S, Schmalbrock P and Nichols-Larsen DS. Frontoparietal white matter integrity predicts haptic performance in chronic stroke. *Neuroimage Clin* 2016; 10: 129–139.
86. Jang SH and Lee MY. Correlation between somatosensory function and cortical activation induced by touch stimulation in patients with intracerebral hemorrhage. *Int J Neurosci* 2013; 123: 248–252.
87. Tecchio F, Zappasodi F, Tombini M, Caulo M, Vernieri F and Rossini PM. Interhemispheric asymmetry of primary hand representation and recovery after stroke: a MEG study. *Neuroimage* 2007; 36: 1057–1064.
88. Carey LM, Abbott DF, Lamp G, Puce A, Seitz RJ and Donnan GA. Same intervention-different reorganization: the impact of lesion location on training-facilitated somatosensory recovery after stroke. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2016; 30: 988–1000.
89. Dechaumont-Palacin S, Marque P, De Boissezon X, et al. Neural correlates of proprioceptive integration in the contralesional hemisphere of very impaired patients shortly after a subcortical stroke: an fMRI study. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2008; 22: 154–165.
90. Borstad AL, Bird T, Choi S, Goodman L, Schmalbrock P and Nichols-Larsen DS. Sensorimotor training and neural reorganization after stroke: a case series. *J Neurol Phys Ther* 2013; 37: 27–36.
91. Blennerhassett JM, Matyas TA and Carey LM. Impaired discrimination of surface friction contributes to pinch grip deficit after stroke. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2007; 21: 263–272.
92. Kong K-H, Chua KS and Lee J. Recovery of upper limb dexterity in patients more than 1 year after stroke: frequency, clinical correlates and predictors. *Neurorehabilitation* 2011; 28: 105–111.
93. Borstad AL and Nichols-Larsen DS. Assessing and treating higher level somatosensory impairments post stroke. *Topics Stroke Rehab* 2014; 21: 290–295.
94. Butler RA, Lambon Ralph MA and Woollams AM. Capturing multidimensionality in stroke aphasia: mapping principal behavioural components to neural structures. *Brain* 2014; 137: 3248–3266.
95. Werring DJ, Frazer DW, Coward LJ, et al. Cognitive dysfunction in patients with cerebral microbleeds on T2*-weighted gradient-echo MRI. *Brain* 2004; 127: 2265–2275.
96. O'Sullivan M, Morris RG, Huckstep B, Jones DK, Williams SC and Markus HS. Diffusion tensor MRI correlates with executive dysfunction in patients with ischaemic leukoaraiosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr* 2004; 75: 441–447.
97. Senda J, Ito K, Kotake T, et al. Association of leukoaraiosis with convalescent rehabilitation outcome in patients with ischemic stroke. *Stroke* 2016; 47: 160–166.
98. Anguera JA, Boccanfuso J, Rintoul JL, et al. Video game training enhances cognitive control in older adults. *Nature* 2013; 501: 97–101.
99. Dubovik S, Ptak R, Aboulafia T, et al. EEG alpha band synchrony predicts cognitive and motor performance in patients with ischemic stroke. *Behav Neurol* 2013; 26: 187–189.
100. Geranmayeh F, Brownsett SL and Wise RJ. Task-induced brain activity in aphasic stroke patients: what is driving recovery? *Brain* 2014; 137: 2632–2648.
101. Brownsett SLE, Warren JE, Geranmayeh F, Woodhead Z, Leech R and Wise RJS. Cognitive control and its impact on recovery from aphasic stroke. *Brain* 2014; 137: 242–254.

102. Glass BD, Maddox WT and Love BC. Real-time strategy game training: emergence of a cognitive flexibility trait. *PloS One* 2013; 8: e70350.
103. Raichle ME. The brain's default mode network. *Ann Rev Neurosci* 2015; 38: 433–447.
104. Tuladhar AM, Snapphaan L, Shumskaya E, et al. Default mode network connectivity in stroke patients. *PloS One* 2013; 8: e66556.
105. Ding X, Li CY, Wang QS, et al. Patterns in default-mode network connectivity for determining outcomes in cognitive function in acute stroke patients. *Neuroscience* 2014; 277: 637–646.
106. Park JY, Kim YH, Chang WH, et al. Significance of longitudinal changes in the default-mode network for cognitive recovery after stroke. *Eur J Neurosci* 2014; 40: 2715–2722.
107. Dacosta-Aguayo R, Grana M, Iturria-Medina Y, et al. Impairment of functional integration of the default mode network correlates with cognitive outcome at three months after stroke. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2015; 36: 577–590.
108. Corbetta M and Shulman GL. Control of goal-directed and stimulus-driven attention in the brain. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2002; 3: 201–215.
109. He BJ, Snyder AZ, Vincent JL, Epstein A, Shulman GL and Corbetta M. Breakdown of functional connectivity in frontoparietal networks underlies behavioral deficits in spatial neglect. *Neuron* 2007; 53: 905–918.
110. Baldassarre A, Ramsey L, Hacker CL, et al. Large-scale changes in network interactions as a physiological signature of spatial neglect. *Brain* 2014; 137: 3267–3283.
111. Ramsey LE and Siegel JS. Normalization of network connectivity in hemispatial neglect recovery. *Ann Neurol* 2016; 80: 127–141.
112. Karnath HO, Rennig J, Johannsen L and Rorden C. The anatomy underlying acute versus chronic spatial neglect: a longitudinal study. *Brain* 2011; 134: 903–912.
113. Thiebaut de Schotten M, Tomaiuolo F, Aiello M, et al. Damage to white matter pathways in subacute and chronic spatial neglect: a group study and 2 single-case studies with complete virtual “in vivo” tractography dissection. *Cereb Cortex* 2014; 24: 691–706.
114. Carter AR, McAvoy MP, Siegel JS, et al. Differential white matter involvement associated with distinct visuo-spatial deficits after right hemisphere stroke. *Cortex* 2017; 88: 81–97.
115. Plowman E, Hentz B and Ellis Jr. C. Post-stroke aphasia prognosis: a review of patient-related and stroke-related factors. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2012; 18: 689–694.
116. Hillis AE, Wityk RJ, Tuffiash E, et al. Hypoperfusion of Wernicke's area predicts severity of semantic deficit in acute stroke. *Ann Neurol* 2001; 50: 561–566.
117. Hillis AE, Barker PB, Beauchamp NJ, Gordon B and Wityk RJ. MR perfusion imaging reveals regions of hypoperfusion associated with aphasia and neglect. *Neurology* 2000; 55: 782–788.
118. Hillis AE and Heidler J. Mechanisms of early aphasia recovery. *Aphasiology* 2002; 16: 885–895.
119. Hillis AE, Kleinman JT, Newhart M, et al. Restoring cerebral blood flow reveals neural regions critical for naming. *J Neurosci* 2006; 26: 8069–8073.
120. Croquelois A, Wintermark M, Reichhart M, Meuli R and Bogousslavsky J. Aphasia in hyperacute stroke: language follows brain penumbra dynamics. *Ann Neurol* 2003; 54: 321–329.
121. Reineck LA, Agarwal S and Hillis AE. “Diffusion-clinical mismatch” is associated with potential for early recovery of aphasia. *Neurology* 2005; 64: 828–833.
122. Fridriksson J. Preservation and modulation of specific left hemisphere regions is vital for treated recovery from anomia in stroke. *J Neurosci* 2010; 30: 11558–11564.
123. Kummerer D, Hartwigsen G, Kellmeyer P, et al. Damage to ventral and dorsal language pathways in acute aphasia. *Brain* 2013; 136: 619–629.
124. Yang H, Bai L, Zhou Y, et al. Increased inter-hemispheric resting-state functional connectivity in acute lacunar stroke patients with aphasia. *Exp Brain Res* 2017; 235: 941–948.
125. Kreisler A, Godefroy O, Delmaire C, et al. The anatomy of aphasia revisited. *Neurology* 2000; 54: 1117–1123.
126. Forkel SJ, Thiebaut de Schotten M, Dell'Acqua F, et al. Anatomical predictors of aphasia recovery: a tractography study of bilateral perisylvian language networks. *Brain* 2014; 137: 2027–2039.
127. Geranmayeh F, Leech R and Wise RJ. Network dysfunction predicts speech production after left hemisphere stroke. *Neurology* 2016; 86: 1296–1305.
128. Saur D, Ronneberger O, Kummerer D, Mader I, Weiller C and Kloppel S. Early functional magnetic resonance imaging activations predict language outcome after stroke. *Brain* 2010; 133: 1252–1264.
129. Leff AP, Schofield TM, Crinion JT, et al. The left superior temporal gyrus is a shared substrate for auditory short-term memory and speech comprehension: evidence from 210 patients with stroke. *Brain* 2009; 132: 3401–3410.
130. Butler RA, Lambon Ralph MA and Woollams AM. Capturing multidimensionality in stroke aphasia: mapping principal behavioural components to neural structures. *Brain* 2014; 137: 3248–3266.
131. Turken AU and Dronkers NF. The neural architecture of the language comprehension network: converging evidence from lesion and connectivity analyses. *Front Syst Neurosci* 2011; 5: 1.
132. Marchina S, Zhu LL, Norton A, Zipse L, Wan CY and Schlaug G. Impairment of speech production predicted by lesion load of the left arcuate fasciculus. *Stroke* 2011; 42: 2251–2256.
133. Wang J, Marchina S, Norton AC, Wan CY and Schlaug G. Predicting speech fluency and naming abilities in aphasic patients. *Front Hum Neurosci* 2013; 7: 831.
134. Price CJ, Seghier ML and Leff AP. Predicting language outcome and recovery after stroke: the PLORAS system. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2010; 6: 202–210.
135. Hope TM, Seghier ML, Leff AP and Price CJ. Predicting outcome and recovery after stroke with lesions extracted from MRI images. *Neuroimage Clin* 2013; 2: 424–433.

136. Meinzer M, Mohammadi S, Kugel H, et al. Integrity of the hippocampus and surrounding white matter is correlated with language training success in aphasia. *Neuroimage* 2010; 53: 283–290.
137. Bonilha L, Gleichgerrcht E, Nesland T, Rorden C and Fridriksson J. Success of anomia treatment in aphasia is associated with preserved architecture of global and left temporal lobe structural networks. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2016; 30: 266–279.
138. van Hees S, McMahon K, Angwin A, de Zubicaray G, Read S and Copland DA. A functional MRI study of the relationship between naming treatment outcomes and resting state functional connectivity in post-stroke aphasia. *Hum Brain Mapp* 2014; 35: 3919–3931.
139. Schlaug G, Marchina S and Norton A. Evidence for plasticity in white-matter tracts of patients with chronic Broca's aphasia undergoing intense intonation-based speech therapy. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2009; 1169: 385–394.
140. Fridriksson J, Richardson JD, Fillmore P and Cai B. Left hemisphere plasticity and aphasia recovery. *Neuroimage* 2012; 60: 854–863.
141. Ulm L, Copland D and Meinzer M. A new era of systems neuroscience in aphasia? *Aphasiology* 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2016.1227425> (accessed 24 May 2017).
142. Hardwick RM, Rajan VA, Bastian AJ, Krakauer JW and Celnik PA. Motor Learning in stroke. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2017; 31: 178–189.
143. Menon BK, Campbell BC, Levi C and Goyal M. Role of imaging in current acute ischemic stroke workflow for endovascular therapy. *Stroke* 2015; 46: 1453–1461.
144. Levy RM, Harvey RL, Kissela BM, et al. Epidural electrical stimulation for stroke rehabilitation: results of the prospective, multicenter, randomized, single-blinded everest trial. *Neurorehab Neural Repair* 2016; 30: 107–119.